



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*zhr*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,291	11/10/2003	George C. Schedivy	8002A-86	5428
22150	7590	04/11/2007	EXAMINER	
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC			LARSON, JUSTIN MATTHEW	
130 WOODBURY ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WOODBURY, NY 11797			3782	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/705,291	SCHEDIVY, GEORGE C.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Justin M. Larson	3782

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 20-32,34-37 and 43-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 20-32,34-37 and 43-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 20-25, 29-32, 37, and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshioka (JP 06197245 A).

Regarding claims 20, 37, and 43, Yoshioka discloses a video system, comprising an entertainment unit comprising a display and a media source (video camera), a housing (3) attached to at least one rigid member or mounting post (2) adjustably coupled to at least one headrest support member (9) of a seat in a vehicle and suspended at a rear of the seat, wherein the housing includes a cavity (20) to temporarily receive the entertainment unit (portion 21) in the housing and suspend the entertainment unit from the seat.

Regarding claim 21, the rigid member of Yoshioka is coupled to the at least one headrest support member using a bracket (1).

Regarding claim 22, the bracket of Yoshioka is in the shape of a ring as it wraps around the headrest supports and includes a locking mechanism (5/6).

Regarding claims 23 and 44, the rigid member of Yoshioka is attached to the housing via a moveable joint (16).

Regarding claims 24 and 45, the rigid member of Yoshioka is capable of being fixed to the headrest supports in a plurality of positions along the y-axis (up/down).

Regarding claims 25 and 46, the rigid member of Yoshioka is fixed using a locking nut (6).

Regarding claim 29, materials can either be bendable or unbendable. Therefore, the housing of Yoshioka must be one of the two.

Regarding claim 30, the housing of Yoshioka includes an opening (20) that provides access to the media source (video camera).

Regarding claim 31, a user could also view the display of the video camera through the hole (20) if they so desired.

Regarding claims 32, the housing (3) of Yoshioka is formed in substantially a U-shape (see Figure 6) having an open side (top with opening 20) through which the entertainment unit (portion 21) is inserted and removed.

3. Claims 20, 26-31, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Adams et al. (US 6,380,978 B1).

Regarding claim 20, Adams et al. disclose a video system, comprising an entertainment unit (10) comprising a display (14) and a media source (26), a housing (12) attached to at least one rigid member (upper portion of the seat attachment to which the housing is shown to be snapped to, Figure 2A) adjustably coupled to at least one headrest support member of a seat in a vehicle (note that if a user wants, the rigid support member of Adams et al. could be attached to only one of the headrest supports instead of both) and suspended at a rear of the seat, wherein the housing includes a

cavity to temporarily receive the entertainment unit (10) in the housing (12) and suspend the entertainment unit from the seat. Note that the DVD player and its internal components could be removed from the outer casing (12) if one so desired.

Regarding claims 26 and 27, the video system of Adams et al. comprises a wedge positioned between the seat and the housing (Figure 2A).

Regarding claim 28, the wedge is capable of being fixed in a plurality of positions in the z-axis (forward), for instance, when the book (or whatever object is shown) in Figure 2A is large enough to extend up and behind the wedge, pushing it outward toward the rear of the vehicle.

Regarding claim 29, materials can either be bendable or unbendable. Therefore, the housing of Adams et al. must be one of the two.

Regarding claim 30, the housing of Adams et al. includes an opening (DVD slot) that provides access to the media source.

Regarding claim 31, the housing of Adams et al. includes an opening for allowing a view of the display.

Regarding claim 34, the video system of Adams et al. is shown to have a power port (Figure 2A).

Regarding claim 35, the media source of Adams et al. is slot-type.

Regarding claim 36, the media source of Adams et al. includes a DVD player (10).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka as applied above in view of Tanaka et al. (US 5,729,291 A).

Regarding these claims, Yoshioka discloses the claimed invention but fails to specify the details of the video camera, i.e. it having an a/v port, a slot-type media source, and being capable of playing videocassettes. Tanaka et al., however, disclose a video camera and teach that the camera has an a/v port (57), a slot-type media device (16), and can play videocassettes (15). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to support the camera of Tanaka et al. on the device of Yoshioka so that they could easily mount their camera in a vehicle, whether for shooting footage or simply for transport.

6. Claims 20-22, 24-31, 34-37, 43, 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. as applied above in view of Yoshioka.

Regarding claim 37, the video system of Adams et al. comprises an a display (14), a media source (26) coupled to the display, and a housing (12) suspended at a rear of a vehicle seat, wherein the housing includes a cavity to receive an entertainment unit (10) in the housing and suspend the entertainment unit from the seat and the housing is capable of being fixed to different positions using a mounting mechanism.

Adams et al. fail to disclose the mounting mechanism including at least one mounting post positioned between the seat and the housing. Instead, the mounting mechanism of Adams et al. include a flap of material attached to an upper end of the housing where the flap of material has two holes for mounting about the two posts of a vehicle seat headrest. Yoshioka, however, also discloses a device suspended from the posts of a vehicle seat headrest and teaches that a mounting mechanism located between the device housing and the seat includes at least one mounting post (2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a mounting mechanism having at least one post, like that of Yoshioka, on the device of Adams et al., in place of the flap material mounting mechanism, since both mounting mechanisms are known means for suspending a device from a vehicle seat headrest.

Regarding claim 20, the modified Adams et al. video system comprises an entertainment unit (10) comprising a display (14) and a media source (26), a housing (12) attached to at least one rigid member, mounting post (2) as taught by Yoshioka, adjustably coupled to at least one headrest support member of a seat in a vehicle and suspended at a rear of the seat, wherein the housing includes a cavity to temporarily receive the entertainment unit (10) in the housing (12) and suspend the entertainment unit from the seat. Note that the DVD player (10) and its internal components could be removed from the outer casing (12) if one so desired.

Regarding claim 21, the rigid member of the modified Adams et al. video system is coupled to the at least one headrest support member using a bracket (1), as taught by Yoshioka.

Regarding claim 22, the bracket of the modified Adams et al. video system is in the shape of a ring as it wraps around the headrest supports and includes a locking mechanism (5/6), as taught by Yoshioka.

Regarding claims 24 and 45, the mounting post of the modified Adams et al. video system would be capable of being fixed in a plurality of positions along at least one of the x-axis, the y-axis, and the z-axis.

Regarding claims 25 and 46, the mounting post implemented on the Adams et al. video system, as taught by Yoshioka, is fixed using a locking nut (6).

Regarding claims 26, 27, 47 and 48, the modified Adams et al. video system further includes a wedge positioned between the vehicle seat and the housing where one end of the wedge is mounted to the housing and another end of the wedge if butted against the vehicle seat (see Figure 2A).

Regarding claims 28 and 49, the wedge of the modified Adams et al. video system is capable of being fixed in a plurality of positions along the y-axis for changing a tilt angle of the display about the z-axis.

Regarding claim 29, materials can either be bendable or unbendable. Therefore, the housing of the modified Adams et al. video system must be one of the two.

Regarding claim 30, the housing of the modified Adams et al. video system includes an opening (DVD slot) that provides access to the media source.

Regarding claim 31, the housing of the modified Adams et al. video system includes an opening for allowing a view of the display.

Regarding claim 34, the modified Adams et al. video system is shown to have a power port (Figure 2A, Adams).

Regarding claim 35, the media source of the modified Adams et al. video system is slot-type.

Regarding claim 36, the media source of the modified Adams et al. video system includes a DVD player (10).

Regarding claim 43, the mounting post of the modified Adams video system would be attached to the housing and the other end attached to the headrest post of the vehicle seat.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the Yoshioka reference have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has asserted that Yoshioka's stage or housing (3) does not include a cavity to receive an entertainment device therein. Examiner notes that the stage or housing of Yoshioka does include a cavity (20) for receiving a portion (21) of an entertainment device (camera) therein. Applicant has also asserted that the stage or housing (3) of Yoshioka is not suspended from the vehicle seat. Examiner notes that even though there is an additional support (23) extending to a lower surface, the stage or housing of Yoshioka is still suspended from a vehicle seat.
8. Applicant's arguments with respect to the Adams et al. reference have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has asserted that there is no housing

in Adams et al. for receiving the DVD player (10) therein as the housing (12) of Adams et al. is not temporary, but is the permanent cover for the DVD player (10) and its internal components. Examiner is of the position that all of the DVD player (10) minus the housing (12) can be considered the claimed entertainment unit that includes a media source (26) and a display (14). Certainly one would be able to watch a DVD if all of the electronic components within the housing (12) were removed and remained connected as they were within the housing. Examiner is also of the position that the housing (12) of Adams et al. is not permanent, as the internal components of the DVD player could certainly be removed by at least some means if one so desired.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin M. Larson whose telephone number is (571) 272-8649. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Newhouse can be reached on (571) 272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
NATHAN J. NEWHOUSE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

JML  
3/31/07